

### REMARKS

Applicant has submitted this paper in response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (37 CFR 1.121) mailed September 3, 2004. The Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment required the Applicant to correct the Response to Office Action filed on April 14, 2004. The Legal Instruments Examiner has stated in the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment that "[a] complete listing of all of the claims is not present". Applicant has presented a complete listing of the claims in this Revised Response to Office Action.

Claims 1-23 and 25-35 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claim 36 has been amended. Upon entry of the above amendments only claims 24, 36 - 40 will be pending in the present application.

### Allowed Subject Matter

Claims 36 - 40 have been considered "allowed over the prior art of record and would be allowable if "psi" is changed to "psig"". Applicant has amended claim 36 as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim 24 depends directly on allowed Claim 36, and should be allowed for at least this reason.

### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112 Second Paragraph

Claims 2, 7, 23-27, 29 and 31-40 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 ¶2 for "failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention". Without conceding the point, claims 2, 7, 23, 25-27, 29 and 31-35 have been cancelled without prejudice. Thus, the stated rejections of claims 2, 7, 23, 25-27, 29 and 31-35 under U.S.C. §112 ¶2 have been obviated.

Claim 24 depends from allowed claim 36, which has been amended in consideration of the Examiner's statement with regard to indefiniteness under 35 U.S.C.

ANDRPR/346/US

4

§112 ¶2. Thus, the stated rejection of claim 24 under U.S.C. §112 ¶2 is no longer applicable.

Allowed claim 36 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Allowed claims 37-40 depend either directly or indirectly on claim 36.

### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)


Claims 2, 7, 23, 25-27, 29 and 31-35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Cederquist et al., in view of Lunan et al., "with or without Prusas et al or EP 0 034 560 or Minton".

Without conceding the point, claims 2, 7, 23, 25-27, 29 and 31-35 have been cancelled without prejudice. Thus, the stated rejections under U.S.C. §103(a) have been obviated.

In summary, Applicant has overcome each of the rejections in the outstanding Office Action. The Application now stands in condition for allowance and a prompt favorable action thereon is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Marc J. SABOURIN

  
L. James Ristas, Reg. No. 28,663  
Alix, Yale & Ristas LLP  
Attorney for Applicant

Date: Sept. 10, 2004  
750 Main Street  
Hartford, Connecticut 06103-2721  
Tel. No.: (860) 527-9211

LJR/db:ds

H:\AYR saved\decsifiling\Docs\Andr\andr 346 us\andr 346 US REVISED response\CA 03-24-04.doc

ANDRPR/346/US

5